(MR. SPEAKER)

Assembly again, there should not be any obstruction to carry on the business of the House.

SRI S. SIVAPPA.—We have never said that we are going to obstruct the business of the House. We have said that we are going to impress upon the Government to withdraw this Bill. We are expressing the feelings of the people and people are suffering and that should be taken into consideration. We will request the Government to take into consideration the peoples' suffering and think of withdrawing the Bill. As the chair has suggested, it is a very healthy precedent.

MR. SPEAKER.—Why did not the leader of the opposition do it till now?

SRI S. SIVAPPA.—We are prepared to meet the Hon'ble Leader of the House. After the meeting, what is going to happen, how the Leader of the House is going to respond to the wishes of the Opposition, to the wishes of the people, how the opinion of the Government and the opinion of the people coincide, we must wait and see. I am prepared to meet the Leader of the House. It is a very healthy convention. I accept it.

MR. SPEAKER.—I know the wishes of the people as expressed by the Members here. If the wishes of the people are to be gathered from outside, I do it by reading and by several other things. So far as the Speaker is concerned, I gather the wishes of the Members expressed on the floor of the House, and vies are expounded. The final decision of the House is ascertained and the Member cannot possibly prevent it whichever way my sympathies may lie.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಮರುಳಪ್ಪ.—ನಾವು ಹೇಳುವುದನ್ನು ಅವರು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ನಂಬಿಕೆ ಇದೆ, ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಅವರ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಡೋಣ.

MR. SPEAKER.—I will adjourn the House. We will assemble at 3-30 P.M. and Members may take such steps as they desire. We will meet at 3-30 P.M. and proceed with the work.

The House adjourned for recess at Five Minutes past to Three of the Clock and reassembled at Thirty Minutes Three of the Clock.

MYSORE LAND REVENUE (TEMPORARY SURCHARGE) BIlL, 1966.

Motion to consider.

MR. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Minister may move the motion.

SRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE (Minister for Finance).—Sir, I beg to move:

> "That the Mysore Land Revenue (Temporary Surcharge) Bill, 1966, be taken into consideration."

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—Sir, Sri Krishna has moved an amendment that the Bill may be withdrawn and that it may be circulated for eliciting public opinion. I therefore want an answer from the Hon'ble Chief Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Hon'ble Member has got a bad way of putting things like I want an answer when does an amendment come ?

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—Because ....it is an amendment.............. I want an answer from the Chief Minister.. ....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order. Order......

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—If there is a promise........

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order. Order. Now, I think, I have to make my position very clear. If anybody goes on saying 'I want this—I want that—I want the commitment—I want an unconditional undertaking' what should I do ? Unless the Hon'ble Members obtain my permission they should not at all stand up. Unless I call upon them by name saying so and so, they should not say anything. I am going to enforce that rule strictly hereafter. By simply standing they have no right to go on speaking. If a member catches my eye and if I mention him by name, then he can address. Otherwise, anything that is said, should not be recorded. Yes. I would like to hear Sri Anna Rao.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI (Afzalpur).—Sir, I oppose the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Before it is moved ? With so much of wealth of experience of parliamentary affairs the member says this Hon'ble Members must know what they are talking about.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—According to rule 71, the chair should put it to the House.......

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Anna Rao will kindly tell what is that ?

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—If a member seeks leave to introduce and it is opposed, then the Speaker will ask the member to explain the position.

Mr. SPEAKER.—After so much of experience in so many legislatures. If a motion is moved, then the Speaker has to put it. It is only then that the House gets seized of it. Then it becomes the property of the House to oppose the motion or to support or do whatever they like. Am I right ?

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—The very leave for introduction is opposed in this case. If a motion is moved, then I think it cannot be opposed afterwards.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Sir, as suggested by the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition and as agreed to by the Hon'ble Leader of the House—they have had certain informal consultation.........

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have not said 'Motion is moved'.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Before it is done may I venture to suggest—I personally feel that there is a possibility of certain meeting ground being arrived at. May I again suggest even at the point of embarassing the chair that the House be adjourned for another half-an-hour, so that we could come to an agreement. Because, the Hon'ble Leader of the

(SRI S. M. KRISHNA)

House said that he would consult his other colleagues and let us know what is the decision in the matter. So, it is in that light I am making the suggestion.

MR. SPEAKER.—Sri Krishna is saying that "we are still discussing- Let him kindly come to the dias half an hour later"! What is this? What is the rule Sri Anna Rao? Which rule?

SRI ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Rule 71.

MR. SPEAKER.—Does the Member wish to say anything in support of it? Or shall I read and come to a conclusion?

"If a motion for leave to introduce a Bill"—Now kindly read the agenda for today. The motion is—Mysore Land Revenue (Temporary Surcharge) Bill, 1966 be taken into consideration. Unnecessary confusion for my mind. Poor me!

SRI S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, there are two things before us. One is consideration of the Bill moved by the Hon'ble Member in charge of the Bill. Also there is an amendment by Hon'ble Sri Krishna—for circulation of this Bill to elicit public opinion. So, the best course, I find is, after having a consultation with the Hon'ble Leader of the House also, we have to take some time to elicit public opinion on this most important piece of legislation. So, having that in view I request the Hon'ble Speaker to see that this amendment is also taken into consideration first and then come to an nderstanding that this Bill be postponed.

MR. SPEAKER.—The Leader of the Opposition is enunciating the old ancient unsolved riddle. Before the motion is made can it be referred for circulation? The motion must come before the House and the House must be seized of it and then whatever the House wants to do, can be done. He may please tell me the rule under which he is invoking me to act?

SRI V. S. PATIL.—Sir, just before coming here, we had a talk with the Leader of the House and he made some suggestions regarding this controversial Bill. Of course what those suggestions are known to him and it is no use disclosing them now at this stage. But according to me he desires to consult his own colleagues to come to some conclusions about our suggestions. When we were discussing this, the bell rang and we had to cut short our discussion, and come here. As Sri S. M. Krishna suggested let us have some more time to see whether we can come to some agreement instead of fighting here on the Floor of this House.

MR. SPEAKER.—The members may please keep away those ideas. There was no fighting here.

SRI V. S. PATIL.—That is the reason why I am suggesting that we do not want those scenes here. Let us adjourn the House for some more time or the chair may please take up some other work. We have no objection.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಮರುಳಪ್ಪ.—ಮೂರುವರೆ ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಪುನಃ ಸೇರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ನಿಜ. ನಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಇನ್ನೂ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾಗ ಬಿಲ್ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾಯಿತು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ನಾವು ಯಾವ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಒಳಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದುಬಿಟ್ಟೆವು. ಒಂದು ಪಕ್ಷ ನಾವು ಬರದೇ ಇದ್ದರೆ ನೀವು ಸಭೆಯ ನಿರ್ಣಯಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕಿ ಬಿಡುತ್ತೀರಿ ಎಂಬ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ಬಂದೆವು. ಈಗ ಬೇರೆ ಬಿಸನೆಸ್ಸ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ತಪ್ಪೇನಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA (Chief Minister).—I think the motion must be moved and if there is any amendment moved we may consider. I do not know whether at this stage we can just postpone. It is not possible also.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved.—

"That the Mysore Land Revenue (Temporary Surcharge) Bill 1966 be taken into consideration."

†Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—Sir, I rise to a point of order. This Government has no right to introduce such a piece of legislation which is opposed and repugnant to the Constitution of India, Art. 13. I may bring to the Notice of the House that this Government is a Congress Government which has proclaimed to introduce socialism in the State which has been adumbrated in the Constitution. If any piece of legislation goes against or repugnant to the wishes of the people, it is opposed to the Constitution and it is null and void. Therefore, I would like to attract the attention of the House to Art. 13 of the Constitution.

"All laws in force in the territory of India immediately before the commencement of this Constitution, in so far as they are inconsistent with the provisions of this Part, shall, to the extent of such inconsistency, be void.

(2) The State shall not make any law which takes away or abridges the rights conferred by this Part and any law made in contravention of this clause shall, to the extent of the contravention of be void.

(3) In this article, unless the context otherwise requires,—

(a) "law" includes any Ordinance, order, bye-laws, rule, regulation, notification, custom or usage having in the territory of India the force of law;

(b) "laws in force" includes laws passed or made by a Legislature or other competent authority in the territory of India before the commencement of this Constitution and not previously repealed, notwithstanding that any such law or any part thereof may not be then in operation either at all or in particular areas."

I would like to bring to your notice that this piece of legislation comes within the ambit of Art. 13 of the Constitution. There is usage and custom in our rural parts. The ryots are hit by taxation.

Mr. SPEAKER.—In which State?

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—In Mysore State. The Government has proclaimed equality of opportunity and socialism. There must be parity with respect to social life. This piece of legislation will reduce

(SRI K. LAKKAPPA)

the social life of ryots into jeopardy and they will wither away if the taxation is implemented as has been contemplated by this Government. This is an autocratic Government and their policy is to introduce socialism in the country. Just because they are in a majority, they are bringing in a legislation which is opposed to their fundamental principles. In every part the social life and the standard of the ryots will have to be improved. Taking all these things into consideration, the villagers have been put to dark and they are unable to even consciously agitate the matter. If the conscious people living in Cities are taxed like this, they will have an agitation, because they have an organisation. That consciousness has not been developed among the villagers by the mis-rule of this Congress Government. This discrimination is responsible for such a bad condition of the rural people. Now they have introduced a legislation which is opposed to Article 13 of the constitution and which is opposed to the principles of Gandhiji. Therefore my submission to the Chair is, that the Government, who are wedded to socialism and have got a policy and programme, have not placed their policies clearly before the people at the time of General Elections. They have played a fraud.

MR. SPEAKER.—I have no objection for this Member using a strong language.

SRI K. LAKKAPPA.—If it is unparliamentary, I will withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER.—I never said that it is unparliamentary. I am saying: 'do not unnecessarily go on lengthening.'

SRI K. LAKKAPPA.—I interpret that this piece of legislation is against the Constitution.

MR. SPEAKER.—Be brief and to the point.

SRI C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Article 13 cannot be explained in a nut-shell. I think you must allow him just to explain in detail as to how it is going to affect either a part otrhe entire State.

MR. SPEAKER.—I think, he has finished!

SRI K. LAKKAPPA.—Not yet, Sir. If there are any doubts in the mind of the Hon'ble Speaker or the Government, they can invite the attention of the Advocate General and we can take the opinion of the Advocate-General, so that there will not be any constitutional wrangle or conflict. I request the Chief Minister to kindly withdraw the motion.

MR. SPEAKER.—Is there anybody who is supporting this?

SRI C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, the Advocate-General is a member of this House. I request the Hon'ble Chair to summon the Advocate-General and to know how far Article 13 of the Constitution is going to affect the State of Mysore or any part by just making in a law of this kind. This is violation of law according to the suggestion of my friend, Sri Lakkappa.

SRI V. M. DEO (Gubbi).—Sir, all of us, irrespective of party affiliations or the individuals as such, convince the people and persuade the people by making some promises as members of this House. What has happened is, somehow or other it has been my experience that the Government is thinking that decency demands that we forget everything. Here is one person and that is Sri Lakkappa, who has raised this point. Sir, you have aked us to go through this Article 13. From that view point.........

MR. SPEAKER.—Did I ask anybody to go through Article 13?

SRI V. M. DEO.—If the suggestion is acted upon, I will go through the article and make some contribution if I can.

SRI V. S. PATIL.—May I say a word regarding this point of Order, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER.—If Sri V. S. Patil wishes to support it, he may do so.

†SRI V. S. PATIL.—I want to support the Point of Order. Sri Lakkappa has just now Stated that the law that is to be enacted must come within the purview of Article 13 of the Constitution. In this part, *i.e.*, part (3) Fundmental Rights of the Constitution, the whole trend of the Constitution makers appears to be that there should not be any sort of discrimination against any class, community, sex or religion or language, etc. In the same trend. even though the actual wording is not there in the whole of that part, can it not be spelt out that to tax a particular section of the community in a different way than what it is in the case of general public? Sir, so far as imposition of tax on all the people is concerned, there cannot be any difficulty. But, here, the present tax is not a tax at all; it is surcharge, and such a kind of surcharge is not to be imposed on all the other kinds of taxes that are prevailing in the State. This is a special case made out so far the rural area or the persons who are holders of agricultural lands and that is why it will come within the purview of the wording that it will discriminate against the cultivators or the land-holders as against the other holders of land like the urban land-holders, house-property holders and other businesmen who have been taxed. There is not surcharge to that effect. So far as the wording 'surcharge' is concerned, it does amount to a discrimination by the way in which these particular owners of agri-

4 P. M.

cultural lands are to be additionally taxed or surcharged. So, the trend of discouraging or prohibiting any sort of discrimination between people or subjects of the State or of our country will be practically frustrated by this present measure. So, there is much force in what Sri Lakkappa has stated regarding discrimination. I also feel that this may be thrown out by the judiciary on the ground that it is discriminatory. Of course, what the judiciary is going to do, we are not to discuss here. Some of the laws which we have passed here are

(SRI V. S. PATIL)

held by the judiciary as unconstitutional. So, why should we go on repeating such mistakes? Therefore, let us consider this matter seriously and then when we are convinced that it is not discriminatory or it would not come within the purview of the discriminatory legislation' then, we may discuss it.

SRI ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Sir, I support the point of order raised by Sri Lakkappa. According to article 13, the State is enjoined not to make any law which contravenes the provision contained in the Constitution or any law which takes away the right conferred by Part III; Part III pertains to Fundmental Rights. Article 19 (f) says that every citizen of India will have the right to acquire, to hold and dispose of property. The State Government cannot make any law against this.

MR. SPEAKER.—There is it the contention of the Member that this House has no jurisdiction to deal with the Bill?

SRI ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—The House may consider, but the Government cannot bring such a Bill before the House.

MR. SPEAKER.—If it is brought by anybody else other than the Government?

SRI ANNARAO GANAMUKHI.—Then, article 13 becomes redundant. Very recently when the resettlement of land revenue came up, Government raised the rates to about 200 to 300 per cent of the existing rates. When it came before this House and when there was so much of protest against it, the Government reduced it. Within one year, what is the necessity to raise this to 100 per cent now? Are the people who were not able to pay it some time back, able to pay it now? Sir, the High Court has said that the land revenue surcharge is an additional taxation. Now to raise the tax by 100 per cent and bring it by way of surcharge means, we are imposing land revenue to the extent of 100 per cent. The farmers will be driven to starvation and they sell all their property in order to pay this heavy taxation. It looks at if the Government does not want people to own any property; on the other hand they must dispose of their property. Then, Sir, in the land Revenue Code, there is provision that if anybody cannot pay land revenue, Government can purchase it by auction. Therefore, under article 19 (f), people will not be enabled to enjoy their property; on the other hand, they will be deprived of their property by this excess taxation.

† SRI ALUR HANUMANTHAPPA (Deputy Minister for Minor Irrigation).—I find no substance in what the Opposition member said that surcharge is not a tax at all. It is a tax on land. For introduction itself the members raised some objction. I may bring to your notice that the introduction of the Bill was done after it was considered in the Business Advisory Committee. When once the Business Advisory Committee decides that such and such a Bill will be introduced, there is no meaning in the House objecting to its introduction itself. So, Sir, the

Opposition has no case to ask the Government to withdraw the Bill because it will mean scant courtsey to the Speaker. The Speaker has got full powers to reject the plea of the opposition members when they say that Government have no right to introduce the Bill. I do not find any constitutional point involved in this because the Government are fully empowered. The Government can levy the land tax and also increase it whenever they deem fit. The Opposition member Sri Lakkappa stated that Government have discriminated in raising this land tax and the socialistic outlook has been forgotten by the Congress Government and all that. I would only request him to see what are the achievements made by the various schemes.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I rise to a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Let me first give my ruling on the point of order. Otherwise one hon'ble member will rise and say that he raised a point of order and the Speaker did not give the ruling.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ (ತೀರ್ಥಹಳ್ಳಿ).—ಲಕ್ಕಪ್ಪನವರ ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ನಾನು ಸಮರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈಗ ಅಣ್ಣಾಚಾರ್ಯರು ಮತ್ತು ಬಿ. ಎಸ್. ಪಾಟೀಲರು ಸಮರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ತಾವು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಮೂಲಭೂತ ವಿಷಯವೇನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸಿ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಇದನ್ನು ತರಬಾರದಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ತಮಗೇ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನೋಡದೆ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರ್ ನೋಡಿ ತಾವು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರೆಂಬ ಭಯದಿಂದ ನಾನು ಸೂಚಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri V. M. DEO.—I want to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I cannot allow Sri V. M. Deo a second time. He can give me his point in writing because he has already participated once.

Sri V. M. DEO.—I have not participated. I said I will participate after going through the Constitutional provision.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He may say so many things.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಎಂ. ದೇವ್.—ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ತಮಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಯಿತೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೊ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ತಮಗೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ತಾಳ್ಮೆ ಇರಬೇಕು. ತಾವು ಹಿರಿಯರು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Deo and I agree on many points. But one point he has also to agree that under the Rules of Procedure a member is entitled to address out once subject to one condition.

Sri V. M. DEO.—I have not participated and that is where we are differing.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is nothing like participating.

Sri V. M. DEO.—Many a time you do things which are harsh and you do not know. You say 'Sit down'.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Have I been so unkind to this member as to say 'sit down' ?

Sri V. M. DEO.—You did say so yesterday.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Then I am entitled to do it today also, if he violates the rule.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಎಂ. ದೇವ್.—ನನಗೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಒಂದು ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟಪಡಿಸ ಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The member may kindly tell me the gist of what he wants to say. This is not a speech.

Sri V. M. DEO.—I would invite your attention to the Directive Principles of State Policy under the Constitution Article 39 (b) says :

> "that the ownership and control of the material resources of the community are so distributed as best to subserve the common good ;
>
> (c) that the operation of the economic system does not result in the concentration of wealth and means of production to the common detriment.

Now this has to be read in conjunction with article 46 :

> "The State shall promote with special care the educational and economic interests of the weaker sections of the people, and in particular, of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes, and shall protect them from social injustice and all forms of exploitation."

ರೈತರನ್ನು ತಿಂದು ಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹಣ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸರ್ಚಾರ್ಜನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿರುವುದು ಜಮೀನು ಕಂದಾಯದ ಮೇಲೆ. ಆದರೆ ಹಾಗಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳುವುದು ಯೋಗ್ಯವೇ ? ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ. ಮಹಲನೋಬಿಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶ ಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡದೆ ಸಾಹುಕಾರರನ್ನು ಸಾಹುಕಾರರನ್ನಾಗಿಯೂ ಬಡವರನ್ನು ಮತ್ತೂ ಬಡವರ ನ್ನಾಗಿಯೂ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನ 3ನೆಯ ಪುಟದಲ್ಲಿರುವ 'ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪ್ಲನೇಷನ್' ನೋಡಬಹುದು. ಈ ತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಮತ್ತೆ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ದೃಷ್ಟಿ ಯಿಂದ ರೈತರು ಲೇಕರ್ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್, ಅವರನ್ನು ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು, ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಗೌರವ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯೋಗ್ಯವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಎನ್. ಮಾದಪ್ಪಗೌಡ (ನಾಗಮಂಗಲ).—ಈಗ ಸರ್ಚಾರ್ಜ್ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಕಳೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಎಂ. ಕೃಷ್ಣರವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡುಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು, ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am concerned with the point of order which has been raised. I am giving the ruling. The honb'le member Sri Lakkappa raised a point of order. A point of order is always raised when there is any violation of a rule, convention or law or statute governing the procedure or the business before the House. The point of unconstitutionality or ultraviresness has nothing to do with the procedure to be followed. It is not a point of order. It is a totally different point. Sri Annarao has on prior occasions in the course of the Debate pointed out that this House will not be spending the time profitably when it is convinced that it is ultra vires, that it is patently opposed the express provisions of the Constitution. At no time has any member up till now contended either in this House of Legislature or any Legislature whatsoever that unconstitutionality amounts to a point of order to be decided by the Speaker.

I am really surprised that it should have found support from some of the other members who failed to take note of this distinction. All that they said was it was unconstitutional; they never said how unconstitutionality violates any rules. What is a point of order ? When the House gets out of order or gets into disorder, then the Speaker or the House is bound to restore order. If a person does anything

which is prohibited under the rules, then it is violation and out of order. Can anybody suggest that unconstitutionality amounting to ultra vireness is a point of order ?

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—The Rules are subservient to the Constitution.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Constitutionality is something different I am considering the validity. I am dealing with the limited express point which I have to deal with when I give a ruling on the point of order. Sri Krishna is a very learned Advocate and he suggests that the unconstitutionality of Bill before the House amounts to a point of order. Am I to rule that it is out of order. Suppose a Bill which says that a man should be declared insane by the House, suppose such a Bill which is expressly opposed to the provisions of the Constitution is brought before the House, I can say that I will not allow a Debate on it. If a point of order is raised on that, I can give a ruling on it.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—How can I participate in a discussion when I am convinced that it is unconstitutional ? Does a member not owe a responsibility to himself to raise a point by way of a point of order and draw the attention of the Chair and the House in such circumstances ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Not only this House but a multitude of Legislatures have functioned all over the World. Will the member cite a single instance where any unconstitutionality has been raised as a point order ?

(Sri Gopala Gowda rose and began to speak something)

Mr. SPEAKER.—He should not say anything when I am giving the ruling. He can say it after the ruling is given.

(Sri Gopala Gowda still persisted)

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am sorry I cannot allow the Hon'ble Member to speak. When I am giving the ruling I am not allowing anybody to disturb me. I gave a patient hearing to all the members including the Hon'ble Members Sri Gopala Gowda who wanted to say whatever he wanted to say in support of their point of view. After that I am giving the ruling and to interject is not proper.

(Sri Gopala Gowda again rose to speak)

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order. When I am giving the ruling, I cannot allow this kind of interjection. Let the Hon'ble Member kindly resume his seat (Interruption by Sri Lakkappa). It has become a fashion for every member to let loose any idea that comes by way of private conversation. To some extent, I am winking at it. If they do too much of it, as if they are giving a direction to me that a member is raising a new point, they take things to a breaking point. Supposing every member makes a running commentry......

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—If the Chair thinks, that every member makes a running commentary, it is not correct.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If Sri Anna Rao thinks that it is directed against the Hon'ble Member, he is mistaken and I am prepared to apologise to him.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—You said 'almost every member'.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Almost every member does not mean every member and he may be the one whom I have left out. Why does he think I meant him.

(Sri Gopala Gowda rose to speak)

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order. Kindly sit down. After I have finished, I will permit him if it can be permitted. If he thinks that I must stop and hear him, that is something like dictation to the Chair.

Sri GOPALA GOWDA.—Sir, I do not know whether you are giving the ruling on the point of order raised. I thought you were just analysing the points that were raised in support of the point of order and while addressing the House, you posed whether there was any time when a point of order was raised on a constitutional issue. If the Government wants to introduce a measure in this House and if a member feels that *prima facie* it is absurd and unconstitutional, the point is whether such a member has the right to say by way of a point of order that such a measure is not in order. I want to drive home that point. If the Government knowingly or unknowingly wants to introduce an unconstitutional measure in this House and if all the members should confine only to the Rules of Procedure and should not raise a point which does not fall within the scope of the Rules of Procedure, then I think your ruling......

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—I may draw your attention to Rule 311 of the Rules of Procedure which says that a point of order shall relate to the interpretation or enforcement of these rules or such articles of the Constitution......

Mr. SPEAKER.—Not fundamental rights.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Let us not confuse ourselves with the business of the House and fundamental rights.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Let him please re-read it. He is thinking of every article of the Constitution, but the rule refers only such articles as regulate the business of the House.

Sri S. SIVAPPA Now a point of order has been raised and a motion has been moved. A point of procedure has cropped up *viz*, whether this motion is in order or not?

4-30 P.M.

† **Sri. RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE.**—The Legislature is a law making body. It cannot take upon itself the function of interpreting the laws. This is the function of another body. Even supposing that there

is some constitutional point, of-course, it is up to the members to raise. But this should confine to, as you rightly pointed out just now, the matters which relate to the rules for transacting the business of this House. For example, Sir, if a Bill has been introduced in this House which according to the Constitution is required to have the prior consent of the President of India and if it is not taken, it is irregular The members can raise such objections, There is no such motion so far as this Bill is concerned. This Surcharge Bill is not a Bill which has been introduced for the first time in this House. It was a law practically during 1961-62, 1962-63 and 1963-64. This was a matter taken to the High Court.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I raise a point of order. He says the members have no right to interpret the constitutional provisions. I will draw the attention of the Chair, if it is not a point of order, I will resume my seat. If it is a point of order please hear me.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am trying to hear everybody. There should be certain amount of patience while transacting the business of the House.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA(Harihar).—This is a matter which was before the High Court. The High Court held that this Surcharge Act that was passed by this House 3 or 4 years ago was a measure passed according to the Constitution and it was perfectly valid. I do not think any fruitful purpose will be served to say that it is unconstitutional.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I resume my ruling.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—He was telling that the Members have no right to interpret the Constitution if there is any deviation, and that the Finance Minister right. But according to the Constitution, every course is open to members. It cannot be a point of order if any member raise and draw the attention of the Chair. I do not know whether the Hon'ble Speaker is right or the Finance Minister is right in just putting the matter before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Both of us are right. But the Member is wrong for the reason that he only said that saying anything by way of Constitutionality amounts to a point of order. It is not a point of order But on the other hand, the course open to any member who feels that any Bill before the House is in contravention of the provisions of the Constitution, may not raise a point of order and bring it to the notice of the Speaker. The point is whether the time of the House will be profitably spent is a point and whether the provisions of the Constitution have been in voilation. So far as the interpretation of the intravires of the ultra vires nature of the Bill is concerned, the only competent authority to decide is the Court. That does not mean that we cannot discuss about the intra vires or the ultravires. But the final word of adjudication lies with the Court. We cannot adjudicate. But the Court can adjudicate. If it is interpreted by the High Court or the Supreme Court, that does not mean the jurisdiction of the Legislature is limited to bring a Bill to eliminate the ultra vires. These are the basic points which have been decided time and again. I remember that Sri Annarao had raised an identical point on prior occasion and I

(MR. SPEAKER)

ruled that so far as the Surcharge and the tax, I believe, it was in the Municipalities Act or some Local Bodies Act. He wanted to point out whether the Surcharge amounts to a tax. I gave a ruling that Surcharge is not a tax and it may be a levy of money and it is not a tax. But it does not mean that the House cannot discuss it. This Surcharge Bill I believe, has been passed in the past. It is not only in this Legislature that such Bill has been passed, but also in several Legislatures such Bill has been passed. Even after all that if members want me to come to a conclusion that it is an express violation in clear unequivocal *prima facie* beyond any shadow of doubt, I am unable to accept it.

To say that we cannot bring such a Bill is unacceptable. We have brought Surcharge Bill more than once and it is being brought in other States also. I do not think any High Court has said that State Legislature has no right to levy Surcharge under the circumstances in which we are bringing this Bill. This is a point to the High Court later on to say that this Bill is bad, let it be done if they feel so.

Then Sri K. Lakkappa raised a point which was ably supported by article 137 ; in fact Sri Deo invoked the Directive Principles. I have already said that there is no article which is violated in such a manner as to out-rage by the express provision of the Constitution. And therefore, it is not for him to say that. What was said was that the article provides for socialistic pattern of society and the directive principles also aimed at that. There, it is said that legislation should be brought for that purpose. Sri K. Lakkappa raised article 13 and it was supported as a consequence by article 39. Article 19 does not come into the picture at all. There is no discrimination.

SRI K. LAKKAPPA.—The contention is that the consequence of this surcharge will lead to discrimination in the living condition of the people. Even according to the directive principles, the consequence of this Bill will lead the raiyats to pauperism in this Country,

MR. SPEAKER.—Sri Lakkappa says that if this legislation is passed somebody is going to be hit hard and his financial position will not be the same as before. Article 19 has nothing to do with the financial position of anybody. Neither article 13, nor 14 nor—I will add, article 15, will never come into the picture. The fundamental rights have been declared and these are quite different—right of expression, freedom of speech, etc.

SRI K. LAKKAPPA.—Good case but bad arguments ;

MR. SPEAKER.—Bad argument, bad case. They do not come as a point of order. Therefore, please follow the procedure.

SRI ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—May I bring to your kind notice some of the points Sir. If you permit me, I will say something which is very pertinent.

MR. SPEAKER.—May be pertinent, but I am not going to allow.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Because you gave a ruling-if you are not empowered to give any ruling on the constitutional point, we will leave it at that. Because the Speaker cannot give any ruling. Why should you say that this is invalid, that is invalid ?

Mr. SPEAKER—The Member has forced it on me.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI—Even if you are forced, you ought not to give ruling

Mr SPEAKER.—If a point has been raised and if Members press that I should give a ruling, if I give it, it is a ruling binding on the House. It does not bind the high court and it does not bind anybody. It binds nobody else, except this House I am competent and I have given a ruling and I am giving it because the parties are insisting.

Sri S GOPALA GOWDA.—I rise a point of order, Sir. You just moved a motion. But you did not put it to the House. You have called upon the Minister. The chair has to put it to the House.

Mr SPEAKER—The Hon'ble Member is right. I accept whenever I am in error. This is the finest point of order that has ever been raised. I am thankful to Sri Gopala Gowda. The Motion has already been moved.

"That the Mysore Land Revenue (temporary surcharge) Bill 1966 be taken into consideration" and it is before the House.

† **Sri RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE** (Minister for Finance).—Sir, as I submitted a little earlier, it is not the first time that such a Bill is brought before this Hon'ble House. Sir in 1961, the Government brought the Land Revenue Surcharge Bill before this House and it was passed into an Act. That remained in force for three years namely 1961-62, 1962-63 and 1963-64. At that time, the Government was engaged in the work of land revenue resettlement Sir, as Hon'ble Members of this House are aware, that resettlement was not made in certain parts of the State for over 30 years. And in certain other parts for over 70-80 years. Therefore, the surcharge Bill that was brought before this House in 1961 was intended to be in force for three years till the resettlement was finalised.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಬೈರಾಪ್ಪಜಿ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಪತಿಯವರೇ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲೇ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗ ತಂದಿರುವ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನ ವಿಷಯ ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು.

† **Sri G. V. GOWDA** (Palya). On going through the Bill Sir, I also thought that I should raise a point of order. This is a new point. This levy of surcharge is contemplated under Land Revenue Act-XII of 1961. We have adopted that Act. Therefore, we have adopted the increase of land revenue. But we have not yet implemented. The Act has been passed, the revision has not been implemented anywhere in the State. It has to be implemented after the survey settlement is completed. It is proposed to levy this surcharge on the revised assessment which has not come into force at all. What I would submit is that such a legislation may not be tenable and whether it is in order

(SRI G. V. GOWDA)

to think of levying surcharge on an assessment which has not been implemented. Unless the survey and resettlement is completed, that cannot be implemented. Pending the implementation of the new assessment, is it valid or is it proper to think of levying surcharge on the revised assessment? I can understand if it is a surcharge on the existing land revenue. But this Bill proposes to levy surcharge on land revenue which is to be revised under the Land Revenue Act which itself is to be implemented. Therefore, in my opinion, it is not in order. It is not tenable, it is not maintainable, because it proposes to levy surcharge on a tax which has not come into being at all.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no point of order. It may be a good point for argument in the course of the Debate. How far it finds acceptance is not my province. I rule that there is no point of order.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಪತಿಗಳವರೇ, ನನ್ನ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಿತ್ರರು ಹೇಳುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಈ ವಿಷಯ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಜನ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯರು ಮಾತನಾಡುವ ಕನ್ನಡ ಭಾಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಂಗ್ಲೀಷಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರೆ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಲಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ರಾಮಕೃಷ್ಣ ಹೆಗ್ಗಡೆ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನು ಈಗ ಬಂದು........

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is it a Point of Order? I have heard. The House has heard. It is for him to decide.

Sri A. P. APPANNA (Virajpet)—I rise to a point of order. Can the Hon'ble Minister change his language from English to Kannada?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Let him please read the rule.

ಶ್ರೀ ರಾಮಕೃಷ್ಣ ಹೆಗ್ಗಡೆ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹೊತ್ತು ಮುಂಚೆ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ, ಇದ್ದುದು ಏನೆಂದರೆ ಈ ಕಂದಾಯ........

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಎಂ. ಕೃಷ್ಣ.—ನನ್ನದು ಒಂದು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪ ಇದೆ. When the Speaker says: the Bill has been introduced, when is it deemed to be introduced? What is an introduction of the Bill? When the Speaker says that the Bill is introduced, we take that it is introduced. When Sri Gopal Gowda pointed it out that you have not moved the Bill, you said that it be taken into consideration. Now we are at the stage of considering this Land Revenue (Temporary Surcharge) Bill. Even before the Minister makes out a case for the proposed enhancement, that is, for the proposed introduction of surcharge, I respectfully submit that I must be permitted to move my amendment. This will be in accordance with the procedure indicated in the "Parliamentary Procedure in India" by Mukherjee; Sir, you yourself have sent this book to me.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Krishna thinks that I made a mistake in sending it to him?

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—I would not like to blame you. When a motion is made, there is an order: that the Bill be circulated, that it be referred to a Select Committee or a Joint Select Committee consisting of the Members of both the Houses, that the Bill be taken into consideration. So, it is in this order. Now I submit that my amend-

ment is very relevant to the motion that the Minister is making. Before the Minister makes his speech in support of the measure, I MUST BE PERMITTED to move this amendment. If the House were to accept it, there will not be any need for the Minister to make a speech in support of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is all. The Hon'ble Minister may continue.

ಶ್ರೀ ರಾಮಕೃಷ್ಣ ಹೆಗಡೆ.—ಈ ಕಂದಾಯ ಪುನರ್ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ......

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—I want a clarification.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have called upon the Minister. There must be a limit to all these things. Order, order.

ಶ್ರೀ ರಾಮಕೃಷ್ಣ ಹೆಗಡೆ.—ಈ ಕಂದಾಯ ಪುನರ್ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ವಿಚಾರವು ಕಳೆದ ಕೆಲವು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ಸರಕಾರದ ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಿತು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕಾದ ಕ್ರಮ ಸರಕಾರ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದೆ. ಕನಿಷ್ಠ ಪಕ್ಷ ಮೊದಲು ಎಷ್ಟು ಕಂದಾಯ ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತಿತ್ತೋ ಅದರ ಎರಡರಷ್ಟು ಕಂದಾಯ ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ನಮ್ಮ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷೆಯಾಗಿತ್ತು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ನಾನು ಒಂದು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪ ಎತ್ತುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅದು ಯಾವ ರೂಲ್‌ಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಿದೆ ಹೇಳಬೇಕು. ನೀವು ಎತ್ತುವ ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪ ಏನು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಯಾವ ರೂಲು ವಾಯಲೇಟ್ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ ಹೇಳಬೇಕು. ಯಾವ ರೂಲು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿದ್ದರೆ ಹೇಳಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಇದು ಕನ್‌ವೆನ್‌ಷನ್.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮುಂದೆ ಹೇಳಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟಿನಲ್ಲಿಯಾಗಲಿ, ವಿಧಾನ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಾಗಲಿ ಯಾವದೇ ಒಂದು ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ತರುವುದಾದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಪೋರ್ಟ್‌ಫೋಲಿಯೋ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಅಂದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಪೋರ್ಟ್‌ಫೋಲಿಯೋ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಹೊತ್ತಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥವರು ಅದನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ತರಬೇಕು. ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ಕಂದಾಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು......

Mr. SPEAKER.—Please refer to the Rules. Any Minister can function on behalf any other Minister.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಹಿಂದೆ ಇದ್ದಂಥ ಕನ್‌ವೆನ್‌ಶನ್ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾನು ಈ ಮೊದಲು 1952-57 ರವರೆಗೆ ವಿಧಾನ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯನಾಗಿದ್ದೆನು. ಈಗ ಮೂರು-ನಾಲ್ಕು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ನಾನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನನಗೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಅನುಭವದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಸಚಿವರ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ಪ್ರಕಟವಾಗಿ ಅವರೇ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವಿದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಯಾವದೇ ರೂಲಿನ ಉದ್ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿ ಕನ್‌ವೆನ್‌ಷನ್ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಸಚಿವರಾಗಲಿ, ಅಥವಾ ಯಾವ ಸಚಿವರೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಒಂದು ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಬಹುದು. ಒಬ್ಬ ಮಂತ್ರಿಯು ಮಂಡಿಸಿದ ಒಂದು ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬ ಮಂತ್ರಿಯು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಸಹ ಹೋಗಬಹುದು. ಈ ರೀತಿ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಬೇರೆ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅಥವಾ ಬೇರೆ ಊರಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬರು ಅಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಅದರ ಉದ್ದೇಶ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಕಂದಾಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ಬರದೇ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಜಾಯಿಂಟ್ ರೆಸ್ಪಾನ್ಸಿಬಲಿಟಿ ಇರಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಇದು ಸತ್ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Rule says: "Member in charge" means—(i) in the case of a Government Bill, any member acting on behalf of the Government..." ಪೋರ್ಟ್‌ಫೋಲಿಯೋ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಹೋಗಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಎಲ್ಲಿ ಇದೆ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಇದು ಕನ್‌ವೆನ್‌ಷನ್.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—I entirely agree. Any Minister can be in charge of a Bill. But so far as a particular Bill is concerned, it must be shown in the printed Bill as to which portfolio it pertains, and the name of the Minister to whom that portfolio belongs.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಮರುಳಪ್ಪ.—ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡ ಹಾಗೆ ಸರಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಬಂದಿರ ಬಹುದು, ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಈ ರೀತಿ ತಂದಿರುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ.—ಕಳೆದ ನಾಲ್ಕು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ನಡೆದ ಒಂದು ನಿದರ್ಶನ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆಂದರೆ, ನಾವು ಒಂದು ಸತ್ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವನ್ನು ಅನುಷ್ಠಾನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

5-00 P.M.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Under which rule ?

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—Under Section 53 under the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business on page 80. The Survey Settlement that was introduced in the last session regarding the......

Mr. SPEAKER.—Be precise about the facts.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—There is another surcharge Bill under the Land Revenue Code and Rules.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Please read that rule.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—"No motion which seeks to raise discussion on a matter pending before any statutory tribunal......

Mr. SPEAKER.—Which is pending — where ?

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—Regarding enhancement of Kandayam.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Are we enhancing kandyayam ?

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—Surcharge - that means " kandayam ".

Mr. SPEAKER.—We have spent about four hours.

†Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—Regarding that the matter has been engaging the attention of the High Court—regarding this re-assessment of Kandayam. On the same principle, this surcharge has been introduced in this House. The very intention of the Government is to raise the tax on the ground that they want money and which has been the sole provision of the Land Revenue Code and Rules. And the matter has been engaging the attention of the High Court and that matter is pending before them. On what considerations, the enhancement or fresh taxation under the provisions of Land Revenue Code and rules has been engaging the attention of the High Court and the details of the case and other things—if the Hon'ble Speaker gives me time, I will bring and produce before this Hon'ble House. And the furnishing of details and other things depends on the Hon'ble Speaker giving me time. As far as my knowledge goes, there are a number of cases which are engaging the attention of the High Court and it amounts to *sub-judice*. Therefore, my submission is,

even at this stage, the Hon'ble Minister has to withdraw this motion. This aspect may kindly be considered. The Advocate-General may be invited to this House to explain on these matters constitutional conflicts and other things. So, that is my point of order. Section 53, though not applicable for the time being.

(*Laughter*).

Because the motion for adjournment of public importance—I have not sent notice of any adjournmnt of public importance. But I have raised. And the Hon'ble Speaker may consider this point as an adjournment motion on a matter of public importance. Once the Hon'ble Speaker considers, then the question of 53—can be invoked. Therefore, my submission is, this provision is applicable on that groud and the Speaker may direct the Hon'ble Minister to withdraw the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—This point of order is absolutely frivolous, because the rule was ultimately given up saying that it does not come within the terms of the provisions of this. Apart from that, this has no bearing at all, because it deals with matters which are pending before Tribunals duly constituted to adjudicate upon. The matter of surcharge is not before any Tribunal at all. Unnecessarily confusing one's self may be good intellectual exercise for certain purposes, but serves no purpose on the floor of this House. Determination of land revenue with regard to certain parts—it has nothing to do with surcharge. On what unit surcharge will be levied is not a matter now to be considered. Therefore, the member should kindly pay more heed to what he says before he raises a point of order with that swiftness.

ಶ್ರೀ ರಾಮಕೃಷ್ಣ ಹೆಗಡೆ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಕಂದಾಯದ ಪುನರ್ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಕಳೆದ ವರ್ಷ ಬಂದು.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—May I......

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is it a point of order ?

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Under which rule ?

† Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Rule 73. sub-claase (3) of Rule 73 says: "On the day on which any motion that the Bill be taken into consideration by the Assembly either at once or at some future day is moved, the principle of the Bill and its general provisions may be discussed ..." In sub-clause 2, it is said before the Bill is taken into consideration "At this stage no amendments to the Bill may be moved, but if the member in charge moves that his Bill be taken into consideration, any member may move as an amendment that the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting public opinion there on by a date to be specified in the motion." Therefore, before taking into consideration, the motion or the amendment which is standing in the name of Sri Krishna that the Bill be circulated for eliciting public opinion be taken. That seems to be the spirit of the procedure. If you look into the rule, then it will be correct and that we will be following correct procedure.

MR. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Members must attend to everything that takes place in the House. They must not shut their mind to certain things which are happening. An idential point was raised by Sri Krishna. He drew my attention to that. What was the member doing at that time?

SRI ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—He was quoting some other rule. I am now reading from the Assembly rules. Even then I said there was something different.

SRI K. LAKKAPPA.—In support my friend Mr. Anna Rao ....

MR. SPEAKER.—I have not called upon the Hon'ble Member. I am also not going to allow any other member. Why should I show any indulgence?

SRI K. LAKKAPPA.—On a point of order, I should like to explain...

MR. SPEAKER.—When a point of order is raised, I can deal with it.

SRI K. LAKKAPPA.—An opportunity.........

MR. SPEAKER.—How many times should opportunities be given? How many hours are spent like this?

SRI V. S. PATIL.—I should like to raise another point of order......

MR. SPEAKER.—Before this is decided?

SRI V. S. PATIL.—That is why I am waiting for the decision.

MR. SPEAKER.—After it is decided. Now the point of order ......

SRI ANNARAO GANAMUKHI.—I submit I have not understood the decision you have given, because my brain—the manhole—it closes some time.

MR. SPEAKER.—I do not want to go anywhere near that. Let us be serious and transact business. The amendment is to be moved after the debate on the motion before the House begins. The debate on the motion before the House begins after the Hon'ble Minister has made his speech. When I call upon another, then two view points arise. At that time, Sri Krishna can be asked to move his amendment and I can allow that amendment and these have to be debated collectively, and put to the vote—first the amendment and then the main motion. That is the correct procedure. If members go on raising points of order, all that I can say is, the time allowed to the Bill—at the moment of time it expires, I will put every clause of the Bill to the vote of the House and pass the Bill.

SRI V. S. PATIL.—I rise a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER.—Yes. Sri Patil may say what is his point of order?

†SRI V. S. PATIL.—The present Bill is for surcharge on the land revenue. Under Section 18 of the Mysore Land Revenue Act 1964 and subsequent sections which enable the Government and this House to fix land revenue or assessement, procedure is prescribed. The present Bill is not only to enhance but to double the land revenue or assessment. It means that the procedure that is being followed or prescribed for charging agricultural or other lands, should be in accordance with the Land Revenue Act. Now, by the present Bill we are ignoring the specific provisions made under the Land Revenue Code for

fixing the amounts paid by the holders to the Government. There is a long procedure given here for classification, then valuation of the crops, pattern of crops and all those survey reports when they are prepared they must be placed before the House for approval. The whole procedure was followed last year and we have given our permission or sanction for the revision settlement of lands. Accordingly, that revision is being implemented by the Government as per the resolution of this House. Now, if those lands are to be taxed again, the same procedure will have to be followed as prescribed in the Act. Without following the procedure prescribed, I submit the present Bill is not tenable at all and it cannot be discussed in this House. It means we will be ignoring the whole procedure that has been adopted and the law that is in force. I would like to submit that the surcharge Bill before the House is not at all tenable and it is against the procedure and facts that have been mentioned in Act 12 of 1964. So, I submit that the Bill in the present form cannot be accepted by this House or cannot be discussed. That is my point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The point of order raised by Sri Patil is sought to be substantiated by referring to the procedure that has been referred to in the prior Act. A point of order arises not because any difficulty arises in compliance or non-compliance of a provision of another Act. A point of order arises if there is any violation of the Rules of Procedure governing the conduct of business in the House. The procedure that is referred to is not part of the Rules of Procedure of this House. May be, it is a very good point to be put forward if it is otherwise quoted in the course of the debate to convince the House that the implementation of this may be difficult. I am not concerned with the implementation or levying of the surcharge. All that have to see is whether the Bill is liable to be discussed here or whether the Government is entitled to bring it before the House. The difficulties that arise in the course of implementation, do not arise on the floor of the House. The difficulties pointed out are wholly beyond the transaction of the business in the House. Therefore I am unable to accept the point of order raised.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—Sir, I rise to a point of order. Please read rule 67, 68 and 69. I had already submitted to this House that it requires the constitutional validity.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Please read Art. of the Constitution.

Sri RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE.—If the Hon'ble Member wants, I am prepared to supply copies of the judgement.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Minister will kindly remember that I am not unaware of it. If a point of order is raised, I have no right to shut it out. I have to allow it to a reasonable extent.

The time allotted for this Bill is over. I shall extend it till this evening. After that I am putting it to guillotine.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಾದ ತಾವು ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು ಸ್ಪೀಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ. ಕೆಲವು ವೇಳೆ ಮೊತುವು ಆಗಿರುತ್ತೀರಿ, ಮತ್ತೆ ಕೆಲವು ವೇಳೆ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು

(ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ)

ಸ್ಟೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಗಟ್ಟಿಯಾಗುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಗಿಲೊಟಿನ್ನಿಗೆ ಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ನಮಗೆ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರ್ ಮತ್ತು ಕಾನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಷನ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಂಶಯಗಳು ಬಂದದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಕಾಲ ಪರಿಮಿತಿ ಮೀರಿಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾದ ಕಾಲ ಪರಿಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಮಾಡಿದಂದಿನಿಂದ ಗಣನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಮರುಳಪ್ಪ.—ನಮಗೆ ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಕೊಡಿ. ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನೂ ವಿಶಧವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇವೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I said : 'kindly read Article 207'.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—If I read Article 199 also, it will be helpful. It is a very ticklish point of constitutional law. Therefore, every word is important. The Hon'ble Minister is telling me that I may go through the articles and submit my views tomorrow. It is a very good suggestion. Let my friend the Hon'ble Finance Minister concede to withdraw the Bill and introduce it tomorrow to enable us to read the relevant portions of the Constitution. Article 207 says :—

> "(1) A Bill or amendment making provision for any of the matters specified in sub-clauses *(a)* to *(f)* of Clause (1) of article 199 shall not be introduced or moved except on the recommendation of the Governor, and a Bill making such provision shall not be introduced in a Legislative Council."

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is it that is wanted under article 207 ?

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—Sanction of the Governor is required. Sir, I will read the relevant portions from Rule Nos. 68 and 69 of the Rules of Procedure and conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly. In view of the seriousness of the legislation, Government will have to consider all these points. Rule 68 is as follows :—

> " (1) A Bill involving expenditure shall be accompanied by a financial memorandum which shall invite particular attention to the clauses involving expenditure and shall also give an estimate of the recurring and non-recurring expenditure involved in case the Bill is passed into law."

There is the word mandatory 'shall.'

(2) Clauses or provisions in Bills involving expenditure from public funds shall be printed in thick type or in italics ;

Provided that where a clause in a Bill involving expenditure is not printed in thick type or in italics, the Speaker may permit the member in-charge of the Bill to bring such clauses to the notice of the Assembly."

Rule 69 says :—

"A Bill involving proposals for the delegation of legislative power shall further be accompanied by a memorandum explaining such proposals and drawing attention to their scope and stating also whether they are of normal or exceptional character."

Therefore, the Government shall explain the exceptional character of this Financial Bill ; the exceptional characters of this Bill have not been explained. In the absence of such rules, Government cannot introduce this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no Point of Order. I am unable to accept it.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Sir, I move :

"that this Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting public opinion thereon and be brought before the House within a period of one year from this date ".

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

"That this Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting public opinion thereon and be brought before the House within a period of one year from this date."

The Hon. Member will have to be brief; otherwise I am going to apply the guillotine.

Sri S M. KRISHNA.—Sir, before going to that aspect of applying the guillotine...

Mr. SPEAKER.—What can I do if members do not co-operate ? Even now, I am willing to go on for some more time.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, the Motion has been moved and admitted and the Hon'ble Minister hardly spent only 10 to 15 minutes, and the remaining time is there. The time that has been spent on Points of Orders and other vital matters is the time of the House. There is a lot of difference between the time of the House and the time allotted for this particular Bill.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಎಂ. ಕೃಷ್ಣ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಗಂಡಾಂತರಕಾರಿಯಾದ ಪರಿಣಾಮವಾಗುವಂತಹ ಭೀಕರವಾದಂತಹ ಈ ಭೂಕಂದಾಯದ ತಾತ್ಕಾಲಿಕ ಅಧಿಭಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯವರು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವ ಮುನ್ನ ನಮ್ಮೆಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಒಡೆಯರಾದಂತಹ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಜನತೆಯ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ಬಹಳ ಅವಶ್ಯವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಭಾವನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಎರಡನೆಯದಾಗಿ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಸಚಿವರು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ಈ ವಿಧೇಯಕಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ಗಂಭೀರವಾಗಿ ಸೂಚಿಸಲು ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ಇನ್ನು ಹೊಸಬರಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ನಾವು ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದ ಹಲವಾರು ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟುನಿಟ್ಟಾಗಿ ಆಚರಣೆಗೆ ತರುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಂದೆ ಬೀಳಬಾರದು ಎನ್ನತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ನನ್ನ ಆಶೆ. ಈ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾರತ ದೇಶ ಬಹುಶಃ ಪ್ರಪಂಚದಲ್ಲೇ ಯಾರೂ ಕೂಡ ನಡೆಸದೆ ಇದ್ದಂತಹ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಯೋಗವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದೆ. ನಾವು ಮಹಾ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ನಾನು ಮೊದಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ನಾವು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಾದರೆ ಅದರ ದುಷ್ಪರಿಣಾಮ ಇಡೀ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಉಂಟಾಗುವುದಲ್ಲದೆ ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ತುರ್ತು ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಉದ್ಭವವಾಗಿದೆ ಆ ತುರ್ತು ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಅತಿರೇಕಕ್ಕೆ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಎಂ. ಕೃಷ್ಣ)

ಕೊಂಡೊಯ್ಯುವ ಹಲವಾರು ಸೂಚನೆಗಳು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಣುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಇಂಥಾ ಭಯಂಕರವಾದ ಮತ್ತು ಘೋರವಾದ ಅದಿಭಾರವನ್ನಾಗಲೀ ಕರಭಾರವನ್ನಾಗಲೀ ದೇಶದ ರೈತರ ಮೇಲೆ ಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುನ್ನ ನಾವು ಅವರಿಂದ ವೋಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಪಡೆದು ಬಂದು ಅವರನ್ನು ನೈಜವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಹೊಣೆಗಾರಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆದಿರತಕ್ಕ ನಾವು ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಮತ್ತು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅನಾನುಕೂಲ ಆಗುವುದು ಒಂದೇ ಅಲ್ಲ, ಇಡೀ ದೇಶದಮೇಲೆ ದುಷ್ಪರಿಣಾಮವನ್ನುಂಟುಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಇಂಥಾ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ನಾವು ಅವರ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆದು ಅವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೆಲೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅವರ ಆಶೋತ್ತರಗಳಿಗೆ ಧಕ್ಕೆಯನ್ನುಂಟು ಮಾಡದಂತಹ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಇದನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನಾನಾದರೂ ಬಹಳ ವಿನಯದಿಂದ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ;

ನಾಲ್ಕು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಇಂತಹುದೇ ಒಂದು ಮಸೂದೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದಿತ್ತು. ಆಗಲೂ ಸಹ ಸರ್ ಚಾರ್ಜನ್ನು ರೈತರ ಮೇಲೆ ವಿಧಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಮೊದಲು ಐದು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಕಾಲ ಎಂದು ಸರಕಾರ ಇಟ್ಟಿತ್ತು. ಅನಂತರ ಈ ಸದನದ ಹೊರಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಸದನದ ಒಳಗೆ ಬಂದ ಜನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ತಲೆಬಾಗಿ ಆ ಸರ್‌ಚಾರ್ಜು ಕೇವಲ ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಕಾಲ ಮಾತ್ರ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅಂದು ನಮ್ಮ ಸಭೆಯ ನಾಯಕರಾದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ನಿಜಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪನವರು ಮತ್ತು ಅಂದು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಿದಂತಹ ಕಂದಾಯ ಸಚಿವರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಎಂ. ವಿ. ಕೃಷ್ಣಪ್ಪನವರು ಹೇಳಿ ಕೆಲವು ಭರವಸೆಗಳನ್ನೂ ಮತ್ತು ಕೆಲವು ಆಶ್ವಾಸನೆಗಳನ್ನೂ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರು. ಅದೇನೆಂದರೆ, ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ತುರ್ತು ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಬಂದು ಒದಗಿದೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಸೈನ್ಯವನ್ನು ಸುಸಜ್ಜಿತವಾಗ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಮತ್ತು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೃಹದಾಕಾರವಾಗಿ ಬೆಳೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳು ನಡೆಯಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ, ಆದುದರಿಂದ ನಮಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹಣ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹಣವನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಲು ಭೂಕಂದಾಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಸರ್‌ಚಾರ್ಜು ಹಾಕಲೇಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೇ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಆಗ ಅವರು ಆಡಿದರು. ಆಗಲೂ ಸಹ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ವಿರೋಧವನ್ನೂ ಲೆಕ್ಕಿಸದೇ ಬಹುಮತದಿಂದ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಪಾಸು ಮಾಡಿದರು ಮತ್ತು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಕಾಲ ರೈತರಿಂದ ಸರ್‌ಚಾರ್ಜನ್ನು ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಅನಂತರ ಮತ್ತೆ ಅವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಆಶ್ವಾಸನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿ ಆ ಆಶ್ವಾಸನೆಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಗಾಳಿಗೆ ತೂರಿಬಿಟ್ಟು ಈ ವರ್ಷ ಮತ್ತೆ ಐದು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಕಾಲ ಭೂಕಂದಾಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಸರ್‌ಚಾರ್ಜನ್ನು ವಿಧಿಸಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ಸಾಹಸವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಈ ಸರಕಾರವನ್ನು ನಾನಾದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಸ್ವಾರ್ಥ ಉಳಿದಿದ್ದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳು ಮುಂದಿನ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಮತ್ತೆ ಈ ಸದನಕ್ಕೆ ಸುಲಲಿತವಾಗಿ ಆರಿಸಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ಆಸೆ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದಿದ್ದರೆ ಬಹುಶಃ ನಾವೇನೂ ಅಡಚಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ವಿಧೇಯಕಕ್ಕೆ ತರದೇ ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಇರಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ನಾವು ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಾಗತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಮುಖ್ಯವಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಜನಕ್ಕೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲೂ ಶೇಕಡಾ ಎಂಬತ್ತರಷ್ಟು ಇರುವ ರೈತಾಪಿ ಜನಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗತಕ್ಕ ಅನ್ಯಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ರೈತಾಪಿ ಜನಕ್ಕೆ ತಟ್ಟಬಹುದಾದ ಅನ್ಯಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಗಂಡಾಂತರಗಳನ್ನೂ ಸರಕಾರದ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಆತಂಕಗಳನ್ನು ನಾವು ತರುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆದರೆ ಕೆಲವರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಬಹುದು, ನಮ್ಮ ಶಾಸನಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೀಗೆ ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಆತಂಕಗಳನ್ನು ತಂದು ಸುಲಲಿತವಾಗಿ ಶಾಸನಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳು ನಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವು ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂದರು. ನಾವು ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲದೇ. ಜನ ತಂತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ, ಅದರಲ್ಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಅತಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚುನಾಯಿಸಿ ಬಂದಿರುವ ಆಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷ ನಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ಸಕಾರಣಗಳಿಗೂ ಅವರು ಮಣಿಯದೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ನೈಜ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಅರಿಯದೆ ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು ದಾಕ್ಷಿಣ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಕಟ್ಟುಬಿದ್ದು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತೆ. ನಾವೂ ಕೂಡ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೊಡನೆ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇಂದು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿದೆವು. ಅವರು ಪ್ಲಾನಿಂಗ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ನಿನವರು ಸರ್‌ಚಾರ್ಜನ್ನು ಹಾಕಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹಾಗೂ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಕಾರ್ಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ನಾವೂ ಕೂಡ ಆ ವಾದವನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇವೆ ಮತ್ತು ಆ ವಾದವನ್ನು ಪುಷ್ಟೀಕರಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಆದರೆ ನಾವು ಸರ್ ಚಾರ್ಜನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಮಾಡುತ್ತ ನಾವು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯುತಕ್ಕ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಕಾರ್ಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಅಡ್ಡಿಬರುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ತಪ್ಪು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಬಿಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನಾನಾದರೂ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಅತಿ ವಿನಯದಿಂದ ಸೂಚನೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ, ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಜನರು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ

ಒದಗಿಸಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಅವರ ಸೂಚನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸರಕಾರದ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟು ಅಂತಹ ಒಂದು ಪಟ್ಟಿ ಕೂಡ ಈಗ ಸರಕಾರದ ಮುಂದಿದೆ. ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಹಣ ಒದಗಿಸುವುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇತರ ವರ್ಗಗಳಿಂದ ಹೇಗೆ ಒದಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು ಎನ್ನುವುದರ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಇವರು ಯಾವ ಯೋಚನೆಯನ್ನೂ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾವ ವರ್ಗದವರ ಮೇಲೆ ತೆರಿಗೆಗಳನ್ನು ಬೀಳುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿ ನಿರ್ಧಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ಇದನ್ನು ವಿವೇಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

ಈಗ ನನ್ನ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅಂಶವಾದರೂ ಸಾಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಅರ್ಥಗರ್ಭಿತ ವಾಗಿದೆ, ಬಹಳ ಜನಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಬೀಳತಕ್ಕ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ನಾವು ಹಾಕುವ ಮೊದಲೇ ಜನಾಭಿ ಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ನಾಳೆಯು ದಿವಸ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆ ನಮ್ಮ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಅಂಗೀಕೃತವಾಗಿ ಜನಗಳ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೋದಾಗ ಜನತೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ನೀವು ಹೊರಿಸುತ್ತಿರುವ ಕರಭಾರ ವನ್ನು ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಹೊರಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಇದು ಈ ವರ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಇನ್ನೂ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೋಗಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಹೀಗೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೋಗಬಹುದು ಎನ್ನತಕ್ಕ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ನಾವು ಒಪ್ಪಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಸಿದ್ಧರಾಗಿರಬೇಕು, ವಿರೋಧ ಮಾಡಕೂಡದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸಾಧುವಾದುದಲ್ಲ, ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ಯಾವ ಅಡ್ಡಿಅಡಚಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೃತ್ರಿಕವಾಗಿ ಜನತೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ತೋರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ನೀವು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಭರವಸೆಗಳು ನಮಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ನಿಮಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಮುಂದೆ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆ ಜನತೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೋಗಬಹುದು. ಆಗ ಜನತೆ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಪ್ರತ್ಯಕ್ಷವಾಗಿ ಸರಕಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ತನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇನ್ನೂ ನಮಗೆ 8–9 ತಿಂಗಳು ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶ ಉಳಿದಿದೆ. ಹೀಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಜೀವ ಉಳಿದಿರು ವುದರಿಂದ ನಾನಾದರೂ ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗೆ ಬೆಂಬಲಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಅಂಶವೇ ನೆಂದರೆ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈ ವರ್ಷ ಭೂಕಂದಾಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಸರ್‌ಚಾರ್ಜು ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಸಚಿವರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಈ ವರ್ಷ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬಂದರೆ ರೈತಾಪಿ ಜನರ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ವರ್ಷವೇ ಈ ತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಹೇರಲು ಇಲ್ಲ ಅವಸರವೇಕೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನೂ ತಾವು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅವಸರವಸರವಾಗಿ ಈ ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡಿ ಶಾಸನಕಡತಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿಸಿದೆವು ಎಂದು ಒಂದು ಸಮಾಧಾನವನ್ನು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳ ಬಹುದು, ಎನ್ನುವುದೇ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಉದ್ದೇಶವಾದರೆ ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ನಾನು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಗೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಕುಂದುಕೊರತೆಗಳೂ ಉಂಟಾಗು ವುದಿಲ್ಲ. 1967ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷಕಾಲ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕಾಗುವ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಅವಸರವಸರವಾಗಿ ಜನತೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಬೇಡದ ತೆರಿಗೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಡಿ. ನನ್ನ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಥವಿದೆ. ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದರಿಂದ ಏನೂ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ರಾಮಕೃಷ್ಣ ಹೆಗಡೆ.—ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಮಸೂದೆ ಜನಾಭಿ ಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಎಂದು ಸರ್ಕ್ಯುಲೇಷನ್ನಿಗಾಗಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರುವ ಒಂದು ಉದಾಹರಣೆಯನ್ನಾದರೂ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು, ಸಾಮಾಜಿಕ ಸುಧಾರಣೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಜನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಎಂದು ಕಳುಹಿಸಬಹುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಎಂ. ಕೃಷ್ಣ.—ನೀವು ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬರು ಮಾಡಿದಂತೆಯೇ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬರು ಮಾಡದೇ ಇರುವುದನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವ ಗೋಜಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವ ಸೂಚನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಬಹುಶಃ ಅವರು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬರು ಮಾಡಿದುದನ್ನೇ ಅನುಕರಣ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಸಚಿವರ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯವಲ್ಲ. ಸಮಾಜಕ್ಕೆ ನ್ಯಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ದೊರಕಿಸಿಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಜನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸುವುದು ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಲ್ಲವೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ತಾವು ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಹಳ ಪ್ರಬಲವಾದ ಒಂದು ವಾದ ಇದು, 1967ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವ ಒಂದೇ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಸಮರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದ ಕ್ಕಿಂತ ನೀವು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಜನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸ ಬೇಕು. ಜನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ ಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಚಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅರ್ಥವಲ್ಲ, ಜನರ ಮುಂದೆ ಈ ವಿಧೇಯಕವನ್ನಿಟ್ಟು ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿ ಸುವುದಕ್ಕೊಂದು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಅವರು ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ನೀಡಬೇಕು. 1967ನೆಯ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಿ ಯಾರನ್ನು ಒಲಿಯುತ್ತಾಳೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ,

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಎಂ. ಕೃಷ್ಣ)

ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಒಲಿಯುವ ಸಾಧ್ಯತೆ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಿದೆ ಎಂದು ನಾವು ಅಂದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಮಸೂದೆಯಾಗಲಿ ಅಥವ ಬೇರೊಂದು ಮಸೂದೆಯಾಗಲಿ ಅವರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಜನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಪಡೆಯುವುದು ಯೋಗ್ಯವಾದುದು. ಎಂಥ ಉತ್ಕಟ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಆಹಾರ ಬೆಳೆಯಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ, ಜನತೆಗೆ ನೀರಿನ ಅನುಕೂಲತೆ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಕುಡಿಯಲು ಗಂಜಿ ಸಹ ದೊರೆಯದೆ ಉದ್ಯೋಗವೂ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಅವರು ಒದ್ದಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂಥ ಹಲವಾರು ಕಷ್ಟಗಳಿಂದ ರೈತರು ಬಳಲಿರುವಾಗ ನೀವು ಸರ್ಚಾರ್ಜ್ ವಿಧಿಸುವ ಶೌರ್ಯವನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಸಚಿವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಂಚವಾದರೂ ಕನಿಕರವಾಗಲಿ ಅನುಕಂಪವಾಗಲಿ ಇದ್ದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರು ಬಹುಶಃ ಇಂಥ ಕರಾಳವಾದ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹಟಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನನಗಾದರೂ ಅನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿರುವವರು ಬಹಳ ತೀವ್ರವಾಗಿ ಇದನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಯಕೊಡದೆ ಮುಂದುವರೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಈಗಲೂ ಸಹ ಕಾಲ ವಿಳಂಬವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ, ದೇಶದ ಜನತೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಪಾರಾಗಬಹುದೆಂಬ ಆಶೆಯನ್ನು ಇನ್ನೂ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನನ್ನ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡು ಜನತೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಂಕಟದಿಂದ ಪಾರು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If members want to participate in the Debate, they must see that time is not exhausted by points of order.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಮರುಳಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ವಿಧೇಯಕದ ಮೇಲೆ ಇದುವರೆಗೆ ನಡೆದಿರುವ ಗಲಾಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಳೆದ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಗಣನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಇದರ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ವಿನಂತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Has it ever been interpreted like that ? If the Members can show that it has been so interpreted at any time, I am willing to cousider that time for the Bill is to begin not at the time when the work began but from the time when all obstructions are over and the debate began and tlll then the time spent is not to be reconed at all.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—You have done so many a times.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have done many things. Please point out where the time so spent has been reckoned by me in the past.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—The time allotted by the Business Advisory Committee for so many Bills was exceeded by the House several times. For instance, for the Urban Land Tax Bill the time allotted was 2 hours whereas we spent nearly 4 hours.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is different from saying that it has not been spent. It is has been spent, it can be extended by various known methods. But the members are bringing a new idea that nothing has been spent and the time is to be reckoned from now afresh. I would request members particularly by Sri Marulappa to study and show me a precedent.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಎಂ. ಕೃಷ್ಣ.—ಈ ಸಾಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂರೂವರೆ ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಕಂದಾಯದ ರಿವಿಷನ್ ಮೂಲಕ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ನಿನ್ನೆ ತಾನೆ ಆಹಾರ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ನನಗೆ ಜೋತಿಷ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಂಬಿಕೆಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಕೆಲವು ಜೋತಿಷ್ಯಕರು ಹೆದರಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮುಂದೆ ಬರುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಕೆಟ್ಟಕಾಲ, ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಳೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಎಂಬ ಅನುಮಾನವಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರ. ಆದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಸಿದ್ಧನಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮುಂದೆ ಶನಿ ನೀಚನಾಗುತ್ತಾನೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಗೆ ನೇರವಾಗಿ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಡದಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಈ ರೀತಿಯ ಕಷ್ಟ ಕಾಲವಿರುವಾಗ

ಈ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕಷ್ಟಗಳಿರುವಾಗ ನೀವಾದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳಾಗಿರುವಾಗ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹಟ ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ಬಿಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯ ಮೂಲಕ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಗ್ರಹಿಸಿ ಮುಂದೆ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳು ನಡೆದಮೇಲೆ ಮತ್ತೆ ಅವಶ್ಯವಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ವಿಧಾನಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ತರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

MR. SPEAKER.—Before I call upon any Hon'ble member, I want to inform the House about certain matters and when I have done that I will deal with the resumption of the Debate.

Sri Lakkappa invoked Article 207 of the Constitution. His Excellency the Governor has been pleased to recommend that the Mysore Land Revenue (Temporary Surcharge) Bill, 1966, be introduced and moved in the Mysore Legislative Assembly. Members have no patience to ascertain facts, but rush and rush hastily to make comments.

Then, tomorrow there is a Party to which His Excellency has invited members at 5-30 p. m. I have made a slight change in the sitting hours. Therefore I want to inform the House well in advance. We will assemble at 12 noon and close at 5-00 p, m., so that members may go with a certain amount of ease to the Party at 5-30 p. m.

One more point which I wanted to mention to the House is that on the 2nd when the Budget is going to be introduced I want to help members with a little drudgery work that has been got up in the Research Section. A comparative tabular statement has been made of the various items of money spent under various headings for the last 4 years ever since this Assembly began to function. We have shown in that so far as Public Works, Education, Medicine and other important heads are concerned every year, year after year, what amounts have been spent so that there may be some sort of grip in the course of the Debate. A copy of the draft so prepared is being placed on the Table of the Reading Room. If members want any further items to be included they could tell me. Otherwise I am going to get it cyclostyled and distributed to members. Such of the members as feel inclined to make use of it may do so. If there is any further suggestion to be given, I will be very happy to receive it. I tried to have some briefing prepared for the benefit of members while considering the budget estimates. If I do it now it will be ready in time, but if I take it up on the 2nd or thereafter, it will be practically late. In that light if there are any members who are desirous they can either meet me or send a note. I propose to give half an hour or 40 minutes. I have heard all that the Hon'ble Members have said. I have heard the points of order which did not help anybody.

SRI C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—How can we help the Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER.—I know that it is my lot to put up with all sorts of points of order. If this is the idea of co-operation, what can I do? I can only rest content with that. We spent practically the whole of the day on points of order. While I want to see that this particular amendment and the Bill get an hour for discussion, at the end of that I may put the whole think to the vote.

SOME HON'BLE MEMBERS.—Please do not do that.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order. I was given to understand that after lunch when we re-assembled we would be able to transact business, but then all kinds of points of order have been raised. I did adjourn the House for half an hour for tea even though I had mentioned that there would be no tea break. Therefore, the only course open to me is to request the House to sit in the morning and in the evening. I do not want to deny members the chance to participate in the Debate. If it is a question of raising points of order knowing fully well that there is no merit in them simply because the rule says that a point of order can be raised and the Speaker is bound to entertain it, I do not think it is proper I do not want to sit in judgment; I do not want to attribute motives. In the bulk of the points of order raised by Hon'ble Members there was no much merit. Now, I call upon Sri Muckannappa to speak and he will take 10 minutes.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—The question of allotting time for this important Bill should be settled first. One hour will not solve the problem; we have to take as much time as we require because this is an important Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Members may take as much time as they like, but I am going to enforce the rules.

Sri SANJEEVANATH AIKALA.—The time that we have spent on the points of order should not be included in the 2½ hours that are allotted for this Bill.

Sri H. R. KESHAVAMURTHI (Gandasi).—I want a clarification regarding the point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPHA.—Both the motion and the amendment are before the House for discussion.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—We are discussing only the amendment regarding circulating the Bill for eliciting public opinion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have said that both are before the House. If the members do not want to participate, let them not.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—May I request you, Sir,.........

Mr. SPEAKER.—Not unless the member satisfies me. In view of the circumstances which have transpired, a mere request will not satisfy me. I do not know what is going to happen tomorrow. So, I am going to enforce the rules.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—As regards the procedure for tomorrow we showed a gesture. I met the leader and yourself and we have come to an understanding that if that is to be fulfilled it must be in full or democracy will take it own course.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I never suggested that democracy will not take it own course. I have got the right to say how the Debate should be carried on. Whatever is going to be said on the amendment is equally applicable to the principles involved in the Bill.

Sri H. R. KESHAVAMURTHY.—I rise on a point of order, Sir, under article 207 (3) the Governor has given the recommendation for the introduction. For consideration of the Bill also he must give the recommendation. On that point I want a clarification.

Sri ANNARAO GANAMUKHI.—I am a raising a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—All the time taken on points of order we will sit and cover up.

Sri ANNARAO GANAMUKHI.—If you say that the points of order raised by us are frivolous, then we will not raise them at all. If you feel them to be frivolous I cannot help it. When we feel genuinely that there is a point of order, we should raise it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Did I say anything about the point of order raised by the member ? What does he say to the point of order raised by the Hon'ble Member Sri Keshavamurthy which is based on the supposition that it is not recommended by the Governor.

6-00 P.M.

Sri ANNARAO GANAMUKHI.—Ordinarily, my experience at Hyderabad, is according to the clause 73 (2), the amendment of the Bill for circulation should be discussed first and this does not involve the discussion of the Bill and according to clause (3) if the consideration is taken then perhaps the Bill may be discussed. When the first amendment was taken for consideration, we can speak on that. If it is rejected, then consideration comes under (3). Both we must discuss it on principle and then circulation business. Both of them are related. If both of them are placed before the House, it will be very difficult and waste of time. You may adjust both of them within the same time. That is what—I want to submit. Kindly take the amendment first for consideration and then take up the consideration of the Bill.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Please admit the amendments, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Until I call upon the Member no Member should speak. But every time it is happening like that.

ಒಬ್ಬ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈಗ ಸಮಯ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾದುದರಿಂದ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಅಡ್‌ಜೆರನ್ ಮಾಡೋಣ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not adjourning the House. Unless the House directs, I am not going to adjourn the House. I am prepared to take the opinion of the house.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—This is a most historic day in the annuls of the Legislature. The whole day is spent on points of order. This is how this Assembly of Mysore is enlightened and is a living democracy. This House must be a model of democracy and when we have supported this by showing our respect to the procedure and all that. The Hon'ble Speaker also maintained the dignity and decorum of the House and safe-guarded the interests of the members. Taking into consideration, I erquest the Hon'ble Speaker to adjourn the House. So far we have

(SRI S. SHIVAPPA)

spent our time most preciously. We shall discuss this according to the programme. Please don't decide this on voting. After all there is a brute majority. The Speaker is the custodian of the rights and privileges of the House in a democracy.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಬೇಸರದಿಂದ ಏಳು ಗಂಟೆಯುವರೆಗೆ ಕುಳಿತು ಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ? ನಾಳೆ ಆದರೆ ಇದೇ mood ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಕೂತು ಕೂತು ಬೇಸರವಾಗಿದೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಅಜರ್ನ್ ಮಾಡೋಣ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನನಗೆ ಬೇಸರವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಯಾರೂ ಭಾವಿಸುವುದು ಬೇಡ. ನಾನು ಎಷ್ಟು ಹೊತ್ತು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಯಾರಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ವಿ. ಅಗ್ನಿಹೋತ್ರಿ.—ಈವರೆಗೆ ಈ ಮೂರುವರೆ ತಾಸು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ರೂಲು 313ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ, ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಸಮಯವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯವರು ಈಗ ಒಂದು ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿನಾ ಕಾರಣವಾಗಿ ಮೂರುವರೆ ತಾಸು ಕಾಲ ಹರಣಮಾಡಿ, ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಎರಡು-ಎರಡೂವರೆ ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಯಾರು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾರು ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರರು? ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕುತೂಹಲ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಇದೆಯೋ, ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಕುತೂಹಲ ನಮಗೂ ಇದೆ. ಮತ್ತು ನಾಳೆಯೂ ಇಂತಹ ಬಿರುಸಿನ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಯುವುದರಿಂದ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳ ಟೇಬಲ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಏನೂ ಪೇಪರ ವೆಯ್‌ಟ ಇದೆ, ಅದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ತೆಗೆದಿಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

SRI S. SIVAPPA.—I raise a point of order Sir. He is preaching voilence.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು, ಸ್ವಾಮಿ.

SRI K. LAKKAPPA.—Sri Agnihothri is drawing the attention of the House under 313 about the powers of the Speaker. Let not Sri Kolkebail think that he is the only member who knows everything. The Hon'ble Speaker is there to conduct the business of the House.

MR. SPEAKER.—I am rejecting the point of order. I am giving my ruling on the point of order. Sri Agnihothri raised a point of order under rule 313. Rule 313 does not deal with the matter. Under this rule, when a member wants to say something about any point other than a point of order, he must obtain the permission of the Speaker and only after the Speaker has given consent, he should do it. This rule has been voilated in the course of the day by several members. But that does not mean that it amounts to a point of order to be raised by Sri Agnihothri.

SRI K. LAKKAPPA.—Point of order, Sir. An Hon'ble Member suggested to the Hon'ble Speaker that paper weight should be removed from the House. I want to know whether this member can suggest this? Is it not an insult to the decency of the House?

MR. SPEAKER.—One more point of order has been raised by my Hon'ble friend Sri K. Lakkappa. He did not cite any rule. Nor did he cite any precedent in support of it. On this simple ground, I am unable to accept his point of order. His further observation was that the paper weights should be removed from the seats of Members. It is not associated with any particular Member. If there is any particular Member

who feels that it is directed against him and satisfies me that it is so, and further satisfies the House, the house may then consider whether there is any breach of privilege. There is no point of order in it.

SRI S. M. KRISHNA.—In great humility I suggest that it becomes too much for the Speaker to ask us to give this assurance.

MR. SPEAKER.—I am not asking for any assurance.

SRI S. M. KRISHNA.—We did not sit till 7 P.M. yesterday. If they feel they have a majority and they want to sit and finish—if that is the attitude they are going to adopt, we are helpless in the matter.

MR. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member Sri Krishna has been pleased to mention that they have brute majority . ...

SRI S. M. KRISHNA.—I did not say 'brute majority'.

MR. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member Sri S. M. Krishna suggests that the continuance of the proceedings to-day after 6.12 P.M. is not proper and because the Ruling Party has got a majority, the Members who have done so much work for the day, should not be compelled to sit longer. So far as the majority or minority is concerned I am not in the least impressed one way or the other. If any Bill or any motion or any other matter before the House is passed or rejected, it does not in the least, influence the Speaker. So far as the continuance of the work is concerned, it was repeated that yesterday we did not sit late : and today if we sit the proceedings may not be proper. What a world of difference. An appeal was also made that it should be adjourned today, and the mood may be better tomorrow. I hope it will be so. But at the same time, unless we are able to transact business, I do not know how we are going to deal with the matter that comes up before the House. I am anxious that there should be debate. I am anxious that the debate should be full. I have never applied the guillotine...

SRI S. M. KRISHNA.—May I intervene for a moment Sir ? There is a circular given to us that on behalf on the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association there will be a lecture by somebody at 6-15.

MR. SPEAKER.—That somebody is responsible for the conduct of business here also ? I am not bound by that notice.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಮರುಳಪ್ಪ.—ಈಗ ಟೈಂ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಅಡ್ಜರ್ನ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

MR. SPEAKER.—The House normally sits from 1 P.M. to 6 P.M. It does not mean that it cannot sit beyond that.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಇದೇ ರೀತಿ ನಾಳೆಯೂ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ತಾವು ಗೊತ್ತಿದ್ದವರು ತಮಗೆ ಅನುಭವ ಇದೆ. ಈಗ ಆರೂಕಾಲು ಗಂಟೆ ಆಗಿದೆ. ನೀವಲ್ಲದೆ ಯಾರು ಕೂತುಕೊಂಡರೂ ಈ ಸಭೆ ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ತಾವು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಮನಸ್ಸು ಮಾಡಿ ಈಗ ಸಭೆ ಅಡ್ಜರ್ನ್ ಮಾಡಿ. ಇಷ್ಟರವರೆಗೆ ನಡೆದದ್ದು ಮರೆತುಬಿಡೋಣ.

MR. SPEAKER.—I am not moved by any of these considerations. So far as my health is concerned, my sitting here is concerned and my capacity is concerned, it is not in the least affected by what we have been doing today.

SRI C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—We are concerned with it Sir. And also the Party is concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the idea still prevails that we should adjourn and find some other time after all this has happened, where is the time to be found? What will Sri Sivappa tell me ?

Sri SIVAPPA.—The whole of tomorrow may be taken up for this Bill Sir. After all there is no other Bill of any great importance tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Two more Bills are there.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Government is anxious about this Bill. I do not know about those Bills. Probably they are very minor Bills.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯು ಕೆಲಸಕಾರ್ಯಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಆಸಕ್ತಿ ಮತ್ತು ಕಳಕಳಿ ಇದೆಯೋ, ಅಷ್ಟೇ ನಮಗೂ ಇದೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು 28ನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖು ಬಜೆಟ್ಟನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರು. ಅವರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳೂ ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಿದ್ದವು. ಅದು ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲಾ ಗೊತ್ತಿದ್ದರೂ 28ನೇ ತಾರೀಖು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಮಂಡಿಸಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಾರ್ಚಿ 2ನೇ ತಾರೀಕಿಗೆ ಏನೋ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಲಾಯಿತು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Why did the Member not mention all these points at that time. He should have said, I will not like to go home: I want to do more work.

Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA.—We did say that Sir. We said that we are prepared to sit till 8 P.M. We will finish these Bills. ಸರಕಾರವು ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಾಮಾಣಿಕತೆ ತೋರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದರೆ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಸಹಕಾರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ. ವಿನಾಕಾರಣ ವಿರೋಧದ ದೆಶೆಯಿಂದ ವಿರೋಧ ಮಾಡಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾಲಹರಣ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂಬ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ನಾವು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆರು ಗಂಟೆಯವರೆಗೆ ನಾವು ನಿತ್ಯವೂ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆ ಇಂದು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ವೇಳೆ ಕುಳಿತು ಇದನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುವುದಾದರೆ ಇದು ಮುಗಿಯುವವರೆಗೆ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಸಿದ್ಧನಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಸರಕಾರ ಮತ್ತು ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷ ಇವುಗಳ ಮಧ್ಯೆ ತಾವು ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಸರಕಾರ ಒತ್ತಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಗುರಿಪಡಿಸಬಾರದು ಎಲ್ಲರ ಅನುಕೂಲ ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ನಾಳೆಗೆ ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If ever he wanted to persuade me by doing in the manner that he has done, he has also a shade of dissatisfaction rather than satisfaction by saying that I am yielding to the Government.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The Chair has to hold the balance, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Not unequally. Series of points of Order are raised.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—He was only appealing to the Chair to allow the Members much more time and meet to-morrow.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What does Sri Sivappa say ?

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—We will finish this Bill tomorrow, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House now stand adjourned to meet tomorrow at 12 Noon.

The House adjourned at Twenty-five minutes past Six of the Clock to meet again at Twelve of the Clock on Tuesday, the 1st March 1966.

WD 6275—GPB—500— 7-5-66